The choice of an antecedent for a pronoun is based on the prominence of the available entities in the discourse: the more salient an antecedent is in the discourse, the less marked and informative (more reduced) will be the anaphoric expression referring to it (3).

So, what defines the prominence of an entity in, particularly, intra-sentential domains?

* Single-factor proposals vs. Multifactorial perspectives
* Single-factor proposals
  * Syntactic function (Subject/head): Null Prouns (less informative expressions) are preferred to retrieve salient SUBJECTS while Overt Prouns (more informative) are preferred to retrieve non-SUBJECT entities (2) and for EP; [6 for BP; [5 for Italian; [6 for Spanish; among others]
  * First-mentioned entities are very prominent, regardless of their syntactic status (7) for English; [6 for Spanish]
* Multifactor perspectives
  * Many factors influence pronoun resolution
    * Gender information and Accessibility (8), in English
    * First-Mention and Subjecthood (10) and [11], in Finnish (12), in Estonian
  * Topic and Focus (13), in English
  * These studies have shown that many factors contribute to salience acquisition. However, some aspects may have been not deeply explored due to the characteristics of the tested languages. For instance, English is neither a free word order language nor a pro-drop one (no null Subjects are allowed) and, in the studies with Finnish and Estonian, free word order languages, only overt pronouns and demonstratives were used to test pronoun resolution preferences.

Visual World Paradigm analysis
- Growth Curve Analysis, from [14], with log transformation, from [15]
- Gaze data on the Object from 200ms to 1400ms after pronoun onset
- Time course of fixations in the Object was analyzed with cubic orthogonal polynomial

### Results

#### Hypotheses & Predictions

**H1:** Prominence depends only on Syntactic-function information, hence the null pronoun will retrieve always the SUBJECT and the overt pronoun will not be preferred to retrieve the OBJECT.

**H2:** Prominence depends on the Order of Mention information, and so the null pronoun will prefer the entity that is first-mentioned and the overt pronoun will prefer the non-mentioned one.

**H3:** Prominence is the result of the combination of various factors, namely Syntactic-function and Order of Mention. Therefore there will be different results depending on the combination of different linguistic information, for instance, null pronoun-SUBJECT relationship will not be as straightforward as if SUBJECT is not the first-mentioned entity, or overt OBJECT if the OBJECT is the first-mentioned entity.

#### Discussion and Conclusions

All analyses show: (i) No effect of pronoun; (ii) Order effect (except WVP F2 analysis); (iii) Interaction effect. Analyzing VWP data, we can see that the condition with more looks towards the SUBJECT is the Overt ÔV null condition (until, approximately, 750ms) and the condition with more looks to the OBJECT is condition Null ÔV (from 250ms until 1000ms). Quassian data show that the condition with more SUBJECT answers was Null ÔV and the condition with more OBJECT answers was Overt ÔV. Conditions with OVP structure have almost the same number of SUBJECT and OBJECT answers, independently of the type of pronoun.

Overall, our results suggest that different types of information, like Subjecthood and Order of Mention, tend to salience accessibility differently, depending on if they are combined or pitted against each other. And so, the relation between Null-SUBJECT and Overt-OBJECT is not as straightforward as suggested by (13), salience is not a monolithic concept.

### Experiment

Participants: 24 adult native speakers of European Portuguese
Stimuli: 20 experimental items in 4 conditions (1)-(4) + 40 fillers
(1) Main clause SVO order + null pronoun [Null ÔV]
The mechanically worked used the engine in the garage when [he/who] remodeled the competition car.
O-mechanical worked with a <engineer-nome> when Ø ремонтирует carо de competição.
(2) Main clause OVS order + null pronoun [Null ÔV]
With the engineer, the mechanic worked in the garage when [he/who] remodeled the competition car.
Com o engenheiro trabalha a <mechanic-nome> quando Ø ремонтирует carо de competição.
(3) Main clause SVO order + overt pronoun [Overt ÔV]
The mechanic worked in the garage when he remodeled the competition car.
Com o mecânico trabalha a <engineer-nome> quando ele remontou o carо de competição.
(4) Main clause OVS order + overt pronoun [Overt ÔV]
With the engineer, the mechanic worked in the garage when he remodeled the competition car.
Com o engenheiro trabalha a <engineer-nome> quando ele remontou o carо de competição.

Procedure: Visual World Paradigm: participants listened to sentences while viewing pictures with the representation of the two mentioned characters and with the location of the action described in the main clause. At the end of each stimulus, participant had to answer to a final interpretation question (Questionnaire).
Eye movements were registered, at a 500Hz rate, with a SMI (Eye-tracker X™) Hi-SPEED system.

### Discussion and Conclusions

All analyses show: (i) No effect of pronoun; (ii) Order effect (except WVP F2 analysis); (iii) Interaction effect. Analyzing VWP data, we can see that the condition with more looks towards the SUBJECT is the Overt ÔV condition (until, approximately, 750ms) and the condition with more looks to the OBJECT is condition Null ÔV (from 250ms until 1000ms). Quassian data show that the condition with more SUBJECT answers was Null ÔV and the condition with more OBJECT answers was Overt ÔV. Conditions with OVP structure have almost the same number of SUBJECT and OBJECT answers, independently of the type of pronoun.

Overall, our results suggest that different types of information, like Subjecthood and Order of Mention, tend to salience accessibility differently, depending on if they are combined or pitted against each other. And so, the relation between Null-SUBJECT and Overt-OBJECT is not as straightforward as suggested by (13), salience is not a monolithic concept.